

REMARKS

This is a resubmission of the Supplemental Response filed with the Examiner on September 4, 2003. In that Supplemental Response, several of the amendments to the claims submitted in the Rule 116 Amendment filed June 25, 2003, inadvertently were not removed, although the claims in question correctly were listed as "previously amended." This oversight has been corrected in the current listing of claims such that the claims in question are listed as "previously amended" and such claims are devoid of any markings of addition or deletion therefrom as discussed with the Examiner on September 11, 2004.

The Examiner is thanked for his telephone interview of September 4, 2003. As discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully traverse the non-entry of the prior amendment and the determination that the application is not in condition for allowance.

Applicants first note that contrary to the Advisory Action note 2, there is support in the specification for the claimed feature that the sweeper brush drive is operable to rotate the sweeper brush in a direction OPPOSITE to the surface movement of the casting roll. Two embodiments are disclosed in the specification. First, a sweeper brush 23 movable through friction is disclosed as follows: "sweeper brush 23 . . . is rotated in the opposite rotational (same peripheral) direction at the roll surface at the region of its engagement with the roll surface, as indicated by the arrows 32, 33 in Figure 2." (P. 8, ll. 3-9.) In this embodiment, as described and depicted in Figure 2, the surface movement of sweeper brush 23 and casting roll 12 is the same. Second, a sweeper brush movable by a drive unit is disclosed as follows: "In the preferred embodiments a sweeper brush drive motor 48 is provided as shown in Figure 5, sweeper brush 23 can be positively driven . . . independent . . . of the casting roll 12. It will generally be driven so that its bristles travel in the same rotation direction as the surface of the roll 12 but at a different (higher or lower) speed." (P. 8, ll. 20-26.)

So, in the first embodiment the sweeper brush moves in the opposite rotational but same peripheral direction, and in the second embodiment the sweeper brush conversely moves in the same rotational but opposite peripheral direction. Having established the support for the opposite surface movement, Applicants refer the Examiner to the arguments in the prior amendment, which arguments distinguish over the references cited in the office action, as well as distinguish over JP '393 and '394.

Turning to JP '393 and '394, Applicants again note that these two references were disclosed on page two of the application, as noted by the Examiner on page 5 of the Final Office Action dated May 5, 2003. Moreover, as discussed over the telephone,

Applicants again submit translations of these references for the Examiner's convenience. Applicants maintain that the previously amended claims distinguish over the '393 and '394 references.

Applicants respectfully submit that presented claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance and should be allowed with the application past to issue. The cited referenced are remote prior art from the presently claimed subject matter. Moreover, the presently claimed subject matter is non-obvious in view of the more relevant prior arts submitted herewith.

The examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned if there are any further issues that require resolution. Please charge any fees which may be due in connection with this amendment to the undersigned counsel's deposit account 10-0435 with reference to our file 29685-68773. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed for that purpose.

Respectfully,

BARNES & THORNBURG.

By: 

James R. Sweeney II
Reg. No. 45670

11 S. Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Telephone: (317) 231-7390

INDS02 JRS 605963v1